

Statewide Enhancement Advisory Committee

January 18-19, 2006

Meeting Summary

This summary of the Statewide Enhancement Advisory Committee meeting is presented by that meeting's agenda items.

1. Introductions

Committee members and staff introduced themselves.

2. Review of Purpose and Bylaws

Brief review of the committee purpose and bylaw sections presented at the June 2005 meeting. Majority of discussion focused on the need of committee members to describe their relationship to a project, if any, before speaking about that project.

3. Overview

Staff briefly reviewed the June 2005, statewide Enhancement Advisory Committee meeting; schedule of the 2005 call for projects; and the process of submittals for the RTPOs and statewide projects.

4. Discussion of Statewide Projects Submitted

Staff briefly discussed each of the 12 projects submitted through the statewide portion of the 2005 call for projects.

5. Discussion and Approval of Regional Priorities

This discussion included a summarization of the number and types of projects received from the RTPOs. Staff presented brief descriptions of 10 example projects in order to give the committee a sample of the wide variety of project proposals received. Examples were chosen in order to have one project from each of the 10 activities among the regional priorities, and to provide as wide a geographic and type of agency cross-section as possible.

There was also discussion about whether or not the committee had decided at the June meeting to accept the regional priorities without change. It was decided that it was the committee's intent to accept the regional priorities without change assuming that the committee believed the regional process had been handled fairly. As far as fairness, the committee was looking for regional selection bodies that mirrored the statewide committee makeup; outreach efforts to non-traditional transportation groups; access to the program for all interested parties; and a prioritization process that treated the eligible categories equally.

The committee then discussed whether the regional processes substantially met the above criteria. After discussion on this topic, a vote was taken on whether or not the regional priorities would be recommended for funding consideration. By a

vote of 9-1 (Opposed: Allyson Brooks), the committee voted to recommend for funding, all regional priorities which made up the target allocations.

6. Public Comments

Audience members were allowed to advocate for individual projects. The following projects were presented to the committee:

WSDOT/SR 97A Wildlife Fencing (NCRTPO)
Nespelem/Chief Joseph Monument and Pullout (NCRTPO)
Chelan/Lakeside Trail – Phase 1 (NCRTPO)

7. Day 1 Recap and Questions

Brief review of decisions made on day 1, and overview of remaining tasks.

8. Public Comments

The following individuals addressed the Committee during the Public Comments portion of the meeting on January 19. Each individual's comments are paraphrased via bullet points.

Karen Richter (Puget Sound Regional Council)

- Didn't believe the 2005 Call for Projects contained enough time for the RTPOs to produce a prioritized list of regional projects. Proposed that the next Call for Projects be announced in January 2007, and that the deadline for RTPO submittals occur in July 2007.
- Wanted to have the WSDOT/FHWA project eligibility reviews to occur prior to RTPO prioritization.
- Would like EAC members to meet with the RTPOs to discuss the Enhancement Program – specifically, to let the RTPOs know what the EAC is expecting of them.

Rosemary Siipola (Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments)

- Believes the criterion of a project existing in at least three RTPOs to qualify as a statewide project is too restrictive.
- Doesn't think the 2005 Call had enough time built in for the RTPO to complete its tasks. For example, CWCOG's Executive Board only meets quarterly, so it made it difficult for CWCOG to complete the project prioritization while working around the Board's schedule.
- Would like the geographic size of RTPOs be considered when a Call for Projects schedule is being determined.

Page Scott (Yakima Valley Conference of Governments)

- Informed the EAC that YVCOG's Enhancement Committee mirrored the makeup of the EAC with the exception of a member being from WSDOT.

- Would like additional time (in comparison to that provided in the 2005 Call for Projects) for the RTPO to complete its prioritization.
- Would like EAC members to meet with the RTPOs to discuss the Enhancement Program – specifically, to let the RTPOs know what the EAC is expecting of them.

9/10. Discussion and Approval of Statewide and Additional Regional Priorities

The committee first discussed the statewide submittals, and then moved on to the additional regional priorities.

12 statewide submittals were received. Of the 12, staff determined that 5 did not meet the minimum statewide criteria of covering at least 3 RTPOs. Staff presented the committee with the option of considering these 5 projects for funding even though they did not meet the above criteria. This option was briefly discussed, but the committee chose to enforce the criteria, and removed these 5 projects from funding consideration.

The statewide committee chose to review the remaining 7 statewide submittals separately, and decide whether or not to move each project to a “potentially funded” list. The list of statewide projects was presented in a list sorted by the project’s main activity.

The projects were discussed in the following order, and were either moved to the “potentially funded” list, or left off that list by the following votes:

- *Yakima/Heritage Trails: William O. Douglas, Cowlitz, & Upper Nisqually Trails*
Motion made by Barbara Culp to move this project to the “potentially funded” list. Motion seconded by Fred Wert. Motion passed by a vote of 10-0.
- *Agency Council on Coordinated Transportation/Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Inventory*
The application was reviewed by the committee, and they determined that it was incomplete (Application did not answer the three required WSDOT questions). Motion made by Steve Stuart to NOT move this project to the “potentially funded” since the application was incomplete. Motion seconded by Ken Stanton. Motion passed by a vote of 10-0.
- *Bicycle Alliance of Washington/Feet First/Best Practices & Training for Bike and Pedestrian Safety*
Motion made by Allyson Brooks to move this project to the “potentially funded” list. Motion seconded by multiple committee members. Motion passed by a vote of 10-0.

- *Washington Trust for Historic Preservation/Re-Visiting Washington - A Guide to the Evergreen State*
Motion made by David Levinger to move this project to the “potentially funded” list. Motion seconded by Ron Covey. Motion passed by a vote of 7-3 (Opposed: Barb Culp, Fred Wert, and Ken Stanton).
- *Audubon Washington/Great Washington State Birding Trail*
Motion made by Allyson Brooks to move this project to the “potentially funded” list. Motion seconded by Mark Foutch. Motion passed by a vote of 10-0.
- *Confluence Project/Confluence Project*
Motion made by Ron Covey to move this project to the “potentially funded” list. Motion seconded by Steve Stuart. Motion passed by a vote of 10-0.
- *Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation/Washington Resource Protection Program – Phase 3*
Motion made by Barb Culp to move this project to the “potentially funded” list. Motion seconded by David Levinger. Motion passed by a vote of 9-1 (Opposed: Fred Wert).

The committee then moved to a discussion of how they would make recommendations from the additional regional priorities. Proposals included making recommendations based upon a potential lack of equity in the regional priorities amongst type or size of agency, geographic location, and eligible enhancement activities. The committee decided to use the RTPO’s priorities as a guide to move additional regional priorities to the “potentially funded” list. Each RTPO’s additional regional priorities were discussed by the committee, and then voted on as to whether any should be moved to the “potentially funded” list. Each RTPO had one additional regional priority project moved to the “potentially funded” list (except for the Peninsula RTPO which had two, and San Juan County which submitted no proposals).

Including the list of regional priorities recommended for funding on day 1 of the meeting, and the statewide submittals and additional regional priorities moved to the “potentially funded” list, a total of \$41,809,997 was under consideration for funding. A discussion was held as to what should be done with the remaining \$190,003 (a total of \$42,000,000 was available). A motion was made by Mary Beth Clark to move those funds to a future Enhancement call for projects. The motion was passed 9-1 (Opposed: David Levinger).

A motion was then made to recommend for funding all projects on the “potentially funded” list. This motion passed 10-0.

The final list of committee recommended projects consisted of 148 projects totaling \$41,809,997. The recommended list was made up of:

- 127 regional priority projects (\$33,464,499)
- 15 additional regional priority projects (\$4,490,785)

- 6 statewide submittals (\$3,854,713)

The committee requested that in the funding recommendation letter to Secretary McDonald that specific committee concerns were brought to his attention. They also requested that the Secretary be informed of program changes needed prior to the next call for projects. Both the concerns and needed changes were addressed in the attached recommendation letter to Secretary McDonald.

11. Future Call for Projects

This item was tabled for a future meeting because the topic needed more time than could be devoted during this meeting.